



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*CA*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,584	09/29/2004	Laurie A. Castonguay	21085YP	2541
210	7590	07/02/2007		
MERCK AND CO., INC P O BOX 2000 RAHWAY, NJ 07065-0907			EXAMINER COVINGTON, RAYMOND K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/02/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center"><b>Office Action Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Application No.</b></p> <p align="center">10/509,584</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s)</b></p> <p align="center">CASTONGUAY ET AL.</p>	
	<p><b>Examiner</b></p> <p align="center">Raymond Covington</p>	<p><b>Art Unit</b></p> <p align="center">1625</p>	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/6/04, 4/2/07</u>   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

In claim 1 line, "alky" is mis-spelled. Correction is required.

Applicants' comments regarding the Restriction requirement have been noted and considered with the following effect. Claims 1-16 and 23 will to the extent they read on applicants' elected species of group 4. Upon reconsideration, mediating disease by Cannabinoid-1 receptor using elected compounds of formula (I) wherein A is benzodioxane, will be considered to the extent it reads on the elected invention. Accordingly, claim 17 will be considered. The Restriction is otherwise deemed sound for reasons of record and hereby maintained. It is noted that compounds of formula (I) lack a common core particularly with respect to ring A and a reference anticipating one group would not render the other obvious.

Accordingly, claims 18-22 have been withdrawn for consideration as being directed to non-elected subject matter and claims 1-17 and 23 will be considered for examination at this time.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for benzodioxane compounds where  $R^1$ ,  $R^2$ ,  $R^4$ ,  $R^6$ ,  $R^{a-h}$  are pyridyl, it does not reasonably provide enablement for the broader scope in claim 1 and claims dependent thereon. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Specification provides no guidance as to what other rings might be suitable and there is no basis in the prior art directed to similar compounds having the same activity as herein.

Scope, for example, of 4- to 7-membered heterocyclic rings having 0 to 2 additional heteroatoms is not adequately enabled. A review of the specification shows only pyridyl described as actual working examples. See pages 147-162.933

The limited data provides no clear evaluation of how the remaining scope might affect potency to a large or small degree.

Applicants have failed to establish that the compounds tested are structurally and functionally similar to those tested herein or to known compounds having the same activities.

There is thus no reasonable basis for assuming that the myriad of compounds embraced by the claims will all share the same physiological properties

since they are so structurally dissimilar as to be chemically non-equivalent. Note *In re Surrey* 151 USPQ 724 regarding sufficiency of disclosure for a Markush group. Also see MPEP 2164.03 for enablement requirements in cases directed to structure- sensitive arts such as the pharmaceutical art. Also note the criteria for enablement as set out in *In re Wands* cited in MPEP 2164.01(a), August 2000 edition. Thus given the breadth of the claims, the level of unpredictability in the art and the lack of direction (i.e. working examples) provided as to what other ring systems might work this rejection is applied.

Though clearly one of ordinary skill in the art could identify much of what is within the scope of  $R^1$ ,  $R^2$ ,  $R^4$ ,  $R^6$ ,  $R^{a-h}$  the delineation between what is and what is not claimed has not been circumscribed. That is, all of what is claimed is not identifiable. In claim 1, "heteroaryl" is one of the definitions of  $R^1$ ,  $R^2$ ,  $R^4$ ,  $R^6$  and heteroaryl is also an optional substituent on "heteroaryl", see  $R^{a-h}$ . The specification only provides some examples of what these terms may signify, but does not limit cycloheteroalkyl, heteroaryl, heterocyclic ring to any particular definition. For example, page 30 teach many preferred examples, but this section is prefaced with "may be" "include" and "or the like," so it is clear that applicants do not wish to be limited to only those named. Again, where the delineation between claimed subject matter and unclaimed subject matter lies is unclear from a reading

of the claims in light of the specification. More than one definition of the general term “heterocyclic” or “heterocycle” is accepted by those of ordinary skill in the art of organic chemistry. Some consider cyclic organic compounds wherein at least one carbon atom is replaced by sulfur, oxygen or nitrogen to be heterocyclic compounds, while others of ordinary skill include selenium, tellurium, boron or tin containing rings to be within the scope of the term “heterocyclic” as it is commonly used, and some definitions of “heterocyclic” do not require carbon to present at all.

The examiner directs applicants' attention to the following three references:

On page 282 of the McGraw--Hill Dictionary of Chemical Terms(1990), the definition of “heterocyclic compound” is a compound in which the ring structure is a combination of more than one kind of atom. On page 490 of the Concise Encyclopedia Chemistry (1993), the definition of “heterocycles” is cyclic hydrocarbon compounds in which the ring consists of carbon and at least one other element, usually, N, O or S. The definition goes on to explain that the possibilities for synthesis are nearly unlimited, and that compounds wherein the heteroatoms are of elements like phosphorous, arsenic, selenium, and tellurium are being incorporated with increasing frequency. On page 594 of Hawlev's Condensed Chemical Dictionary (1993), “heterocyclic” is defined as a closed-ring structure,

usually, either 5 or 6 members, in which one or more of the atoms in the ring is an element other than carbon, e.g, sulfur, nitrogen, etc. These three definitions should make it abundantly clear that there is no one specific and exact definition of the word "heterocyclic," thus when this term is present as a claim limitation, the metes and bounds of protection are not pointed out and distinctly claimed. Though the three above-cited definitions of the term have some shared aspects, chemists of ordinary skill would not necessarily agree on the full scope and meaning of the term "heterocyclic."

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-17 and 23 are, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The numerous substituent variables and their voluminous complex meanings and their seemingly endless permutations and combinations make it virtually impossible to determine the full scope and complete meaning of the claimed subject matter. As presented, the subject matter cannot be regarded as being a clear and concise description for which protection is sought and as such the listed claims are indefinite.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for treating a disease mediated by the Cannabinoid-1 receptor. The specification does not enable any physician skilled in the art of medicine, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The how to make requirement of the enablement statute, when applied to process claims, refers to operability and how to make the claimed process work. "The [eight] factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims", *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. The main issues are the correlation between clinical efficacy for treating a disease and Applicants' Cannabinoid-1 receptor assay.

a) Determining if any particular claimed compound would treat any particular disease would require synthesis of the compound, formulation into a suitable dosage form, and subjecting it clinical trials or to testing them in an assay known to be correlated to clinical efficacy of such treatment. This is a large



quantity of experimentation. b) The direction concerning treating a disease mediated by the Cannabinoid-1 receptor is found in pages 4 and 33, which merely states Applicants' intention to do so. Applicants describe formulations in page 35. Doses required to practice their invention are described in page 35, .001 – 100 mg/kg body weight. A 5-fold range of doses is recommended. Since no one of the claimed compounds has ever been used to treat any human disease, how is the skilled physician to know what dose to use for each of these different diseases? There are no guidelines for determining the doses needed to provide a treatment effect. Are the identical doses to be used for treating unrelated diseases? There is an assay described in pages 162 and 163 but it is unclear how this assay is correlated to any diseases. c) There is no working example of treatment of any disease in man or animals. The Cannabinoid-1 receptor assay provides evidence that the present compounds bind to the Cannabinoid-1 receptor. However, binding does not equal mediation of that receptor with a treatment effect. Thus, there are no working examples. d) The nature of the invention is clinical treatment of disease with a compound of the formula (I), which involves physiological activity. e) The state of the clinical arts is unpredictable.

f) The artisan using Applicants invention would be a physician with a MD degree and several years of experience. g) It is well established that “the scope of

enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved", and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 18, at 24 (In cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved.), *Nationwide Chemical Corporation, et al. v. Wright, et al.*, 192 USPQ 95 (one skilled in chemical and biological arts cannot always reasonably predict how different chemical compounds and elements might behave under varying circumstances), *Ex parte Sudilovsky* 21 USPQ2d 1702 (Appellant's invention concerns pharmaceutical activity. Because there is no evidence of record of analogous activity for similar compounds, the art is relatively unpredictable) *In re Wright* 27 USPQ2d 1510 (the physiological activity of RNA viruses was sufficiently unpredictable that success in developing specific avian recombinant virus vaccine was uncertain). h) The scope of the claims involves all of the thousands of compounds of claim 1 as well as the hundred of diseases embraced by the term mediated by the Cannabinoid-1 receptor. Thus, the scope of claims is very broad.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the

time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).” That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The specification does not set forth any steps involved in determining how to identify “a disease mediated by the Cannabinoid-1 receptor”. It is unclear what diseases and treatments applicant is intending to encompass. Determining whether a given disease responds or does not respond to such a receptor mediation and thus, covered by the claim language, will require extensive and potentially inconclusive clinical research. With out such clinical research to identify the patients and diseases Applicants intend to treat, the physician skilled in the clinical arts cannot determine the metes and bounds of the claim. Hence, the claims are indefinite.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond Covington whose telephone number is (571) 272-0681. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres at telephone number (571) 272-0867.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Janet Andres  
SPE  
Art Unit 1625

  
RKC

  
JANET L. ANDRES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER